

SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress
1st Session

Vote No. 203

May 25, 1995, 9:03 a.m.
Page S-7405 Temp. Record

DISASTER SUPPLEMENTAL-RESCISSIONS CONFERENCE REPORT/Passage

SUBJECT: Conference report to accompany the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Disaster Assistance and Rescissions Act . . . H.R. 1158. Agreeing to the conference report.

ACTION: CONFERENCE REPORT AGREED TO, 62-38

SYNOPSIS: The conference report to accompany H.R. 1158, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Disaster Assistance and Rescissions Act, will provide \$6.7 billion in emergency appropriations for disaster assistance, will rescind \$16.247 billion appropriated for various Departments and agencies, and will provide emergency appropriations related to the Oklahoma City bombing. The discretionary spending caps will be lowered by any amount equal to the net savings that are in this bill (see vote No. 119). The bill will also provide debt relief to Jordan. Details are provided below.

Disaster assistance:

- \$6.7 billion will be appropriated for the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), \$3.335 billion of which will be for fiscal year (FY) 1995 for disaster relief, and \$3.335 billion of which will be for FY 1996 disaster relief.

Oklahoma City bombing:

- \$250 million will be provided in response to the Oklahoma City bombing, \$66.8 million of which will be for expenses related to the replacement of the Alfred P. Murrah building and the remainder of which will be for anti-terrorism law enforcement expenses.

Rescissions will include the following:

- Agriculture: \$95.9 million, with a \$20 million reduction of appropriations for the Women, Infants, and Children Program, and an increase for the Market Promotion Program (see vote No. 130 for related debate);
- Commerce, Justice, State, Judiciary: \$293.5 million (not including \$5.3 million in emergency rescissions), including a \$16.3 million cut in appropriations for Hollings Centers (see vote No. 129 for related debate);
- Energy and Water: \$234 million;
- Foreign Operations: \$157.7 million, mostly from the Agency for International Development;
- Interior: \$248.3 million;

(See other side)

YEAS (61)			NAYS (38)			NOT VOTING (1)	
Republicans (53 or 98%)		Democrats (8 or 18%)	Republicans (1 or 2%)		Democrats (37 or 82%)	Republicans (0)	Democrats (1)
Abraham	Hutchison	Boxer	Chafee	Akaka	Heflin		Mikulski- ²
Ashcroft	Inhofe	Byrd		Baucus	Hollings		
Bennett	Jeffords	Feinstein		Biden	Kennedy		
Bond	Kassebaum	Inouye		Bingaman	Kerry		
Brown	Kempthorne	Johnston		Bradley	Lautenberg		
Burns	Kyl	Kerrey		Breaux	Leahy		
Campbell	Lott	Kohl		Bryan	Levin		
Coats	Lugar	Reid		Bumpers	Lieberman		
Cochran	Mack			Conrad	Moseley-Braun		
Cohen	McCain			Daschle	Moynihan		
Coverdell	McConnell			Dodd	Murray		
Craig	Murkowski			Dorgan	Nunn		
D'Amato	Nickles			Exon	Pell		
DeWine	Packwood			Feingold	Pryor		
Dole	Pressler			Ford	Robb		
Domenici	Roth			Glenn	Rockefeller		
Faircloth	Santorum			Graham	Sarbanes		
Frist	Shelby			Harkin	Simon		
Gorton	Simpson				Wellstone		
Gramm	Smith						
Grams	Snowe						
Grassley	Specter						
Gregg	Stevens						
Hatch	Thomas						
Hatfield	Thompson						
Helms	Thurmond						
	Warner						

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

- 1—Official Business
- 2—Necessarily Absent
- 3—Illness
- 4—Other

SYMBOLS:

- AY—Announced Yea
- AN—Announced Nay
- PY—Paired Yea
- PN—Paired Nay

- Labor, Health and Human Services: \$3.319 billion, including: \$1.399 billion from training and employment services; \$813.5 million from education programs (an increase of \$505.5 million from the Senate bill); and \$92 million from funds appropriated for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (see vote No. 131 for related debate);

- Legislative Branch: \$16.5 million;

- Military Construction: \$0;

- Transportation: \$2.624 billion, including \$2.094 billion from grants-in-aid for airports;

- Treasury, \$612.6 million, including \$580.4 million from courthouse and other Federal buildings projects (see vote Nos. 122 and 124 for related debate);

- Veterans, Housing and Urban Development: \$8.531 billion, including \$6.325 billion from housing programs and \$1.302 billion from water infrastructure; and

- Savings from travel: \$0 million.

Miscellaneous:

- \$275 million in debt relief will be provided to Jordan; and

- Salvage timber sales will be expedited; the conference report will give greater sales authority than was provided in the Senate-passed bill (see vote No. 121 for related debate).

Those favoring passage contended:

President Clinton has threatened to veto this conference report. His threat is unfortunate. If he relents, H.R. 1158 will be the second bill passed this Congress that reduces spending. The first, the Defense supplemental appropriations, contained slightly more rescissions than appropriations. This bill will do much better--it will rescind a net of \$9.5 billion. It is especially significant in that in the past few Congresses "emergency" appropriations bills have been used by Members as convenient vehicles to breach the spending caps for purposes which were clearly nonemergency in nature. In this case, though, we are providing true emergency funding, plus we are more than paying for it. Further, the spending caps will be reduced to guarantee that the savings will be used for deficit reduction instead of spent.

For some unknown reason, President Clinton was AWOL--away without leadership--during the entire conference. The Administration sent a few verbal communications indicating categories of disappointment, but no specifics were ever given. Conferees never heard anything from the President on any specific accounts. After the conference was over, though, he issued a veto threat. He said that unless Congress cut \$438 million in "pork" from courthouse projects (he did not specify which projects he thought were pork), \$450 million from "pork" highway projects (again, he failed to say which projects were pork) \$474 million from government travel and overhead, and \$102 million in "pork" from the Food for Peace Program (which was funded last year at a level below his request), and that unless those savings were then spent by restoring some of the cuts in the conference report, particularly in social programs, he would veto it. We are at a loss to explain President Clinton's behavior on this bill. If he had concerns, he should of talked to conferees. If he believes there is pork, he should say exactly what it is. Frankly, we are mystified that the same man who brought us a \$16 billion deficit spending bill in 1993 that he called an emergency stimulus bill is now threatening to veto a bill that contains true emergency funding for 40 States and that will reduce the deficit by nearly \$10 billion.

Many liberal Democratic Members are delighted by the President's veto threat. They are upset at the compromises reached with the House on social spending cuts. These Senators should not be so intransigent. Many of the items in this conference report are time-sensitive--if our colleagues insist on the acceptance of all their spending items, the result may well be that no bill will pass. In our opinion, the Senate did well in defending its positions in the conference; for example, the House receded to the Senate on Davis Bacon reform, impact aid, and education funding for the disadvantaged.

Other Senators have complained that new items were added by conferees that were not considered by either House. For instance, some Senators have complained about the funding for swine research in Iowa. This funding, though, was appropriate, because the House had proposed a rescission of funds for this research. The conference provision is detailed because a careful compromise provision that redesigns the program was worked out between the House and the Senate. On its face, we agree with our colleagues that this provision appears to be an addition, but it is really a fair, and appropriate, resolution of the issue. The other apparent additions in this report are similarly explainable.

In summary, this conference report does not abuse the process by adding new spending items that were not considered by either House, and it represents a fair compromise between the House and the Senate rather than a capitulation by the Senate. It provides greatly needed emergency aid, and it reduces the debt. As for the veto threat, there is really nothing the Senate can do. President Clinton totally failed to make his views known in the conference, and even his threat after the conference is impossible to act upon because, once again, he has failed to say specifically what he thinks should be cut. We support this conference report, and will pass it. If President Clinton wishes to take the credit or blame for vetoing a bill that he refused to play a constructive role in fashioning, that is his prerogative.

While favoring final passage, some Senators expressed the following reservations:

MAY 25, 1995

VOTE NO. 203

The deficit reduction in this report is commendable, but the addition of a few new, unjustified spending items is unfortunate. For example, the report includes \$13 million for the construction of the National Swine Research Center at Iowa State University. Neither the House nor the Senate bill had a \$13 million appropriation for such a facility, which will be the 13th Federal swine research facility. We would like to know why we need such a facility, and why it must be at Iowa State. There may be legitimate answers to these questions, but because the normal authorization/appropriations process has been circumvented in this case, we do not know. Even if our colleagues tell us why we need this center now, the point is that we should not have to be requesting such answers. These are the types of issues that are raised at hearings on authorizing legislation. We are totally opposed to this type of legislation being added to appropriations conference reports.

Those opposing the conference report contended:

The Senate consideration of this bill was stormy. It finally passed though, overwhelmingly, after a compromise provision was agreed to that eliminated many of the cuts in social spending which many of us felt were unfair to the needy. A huge portion of those cuts have been restored in the conference report, making the bill again unacceptable. We will therefore vote against passage.